

Rubby Attri vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and another

CWP No. 12345 of 2025

28.10.2025

Present

Mr. Arsh Rattan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Kahol, Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocate Generals with Mr. Ravi Chauhan and Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate Generals, for the respondents/State.

Mr. Shubham Singh Guleria, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

CMP No.25095 of 2025

By way of instant application filed under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC, prayer has been made on behalf of the applicant/petitioner for impleadment of private respondents, as detailed in para-4 of the application. It is averred in the application that in the event of petition being allowed, the proposed respondents, who are likely to be affected, are required to be impleaded as party respondents.

No reply is intended to be filed on behalf of the non-applicants/respondents.

Having perused the averments contained in the application, which is duly supported by an affidavit, this Court is persuaded to agree with learned counsel for the petitioner that proposed respondents, as detailed in para-4 of the application, are necessary parties to the lis. Moreover, no prejudice, if any, shall be caused to either of the party on account of impleadment of aforesaid respondents.

Consequently, in view of the above, the present application is allowed and persons, as detailed in para-4 of the

application, are ordered to be impleaded as party respondent Nos. 3 and 4. Registry is directed to carry out necessary correction in the memo of the parties on the basis of the amended memo of parties to be filed by learned counsel for the petitioner within a period of one week. The application stands disposed of.

CWP No. 12345 of 2025

Notice to newly impleaded respondents, returnable within a period of four weeks, on taking steps within one week.

Reply on behalf of respondent No.2 as well as rejoinder thereto is on record.

While placing on record communication dated 10.09.2025, issued under the signatures of Director, HP State Audit Department, Shimla, Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, states that respondent No.1 is not necessary party as no relief has been claimed against afore respondent No.1 and as such, there is no requirement of filing reply.

(Sandeep Sharma)
Judge

October 28, 2025
(shankar)